UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

\_\_\_\_

AARON A. NICKERSON, :

Petitioner, : OPINION & ORDER : [Resolving Doc. 32]

٧.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE:

Petitioner-Defendant Aaron A. Nickerson pleaded guilty to three counts of armed bank robbery under 18 U.S.C. § 2113 and one count of brandishing a firearm during a crime of violence under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).

CASE NO. 1:18-cr-00278

Now, Nickerson moves to vacate his sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.<sup>1</sup> Relying on *United States v. Davis*, Nickerson argues his § 924(c) conviction is unconstitutional. The Government opposes.<sup>3</sup>

For the following reasons, the Court **DENIES** Nickerson's motion to vacate his sentence.

## I. Discussion

A federal prisoner who believes their "sentence was imposed in violation of the Constitution . . . may move the court which imposed the sentence to vacate . . . the sentence."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Doc. 32.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 139 S.Ct. 2319 (2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Doc. 35.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a).

Case: 1:18-cr-00278-JG Doc #: 37 Filed: 04/05/21 2 of 2. PageID #: 246

Case No. 1:18-cr-00278

GWIN, J.

In this case, Nickerson argues his § 924(c) conviction is unconstitutional in light of

Davis.<sup>5</sup> Nickerson is mistaken.

Section 924(c) authorizes an increased sentence for a person who uses or carries a

firearm "during or in relation to" or who possesses a firearm "in furtherance of" a federal

"crime of violence." The statute defines a crime of violence in two provisions—the

residual clause and the elements clause. In Davis, the Supreme Court held that § 924(c)'s

residual clause was unconstitutionally vague.8 However, § 924(c)'s elements clause

remains valid.9

As the government correctly points out, Nickerson's § 924(c) conviction falls under

the elements clause, not the residual clause. 10 Resultingly, Nickerson's conviction does

not violate the Constitution.

II. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Nickerson's motion to vacate his

sentence as unconstitutional.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 5, 2021

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 139 S.Ct. 2319 (2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(3); see also Davis, 139 S.Ct. at 2324.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> *Davis*, 139 S.Ct. at 2336.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See e.g., Knight v. U.S., 936 F.3d 495, 498 (6th Cir. 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See <u>Wingate v. U.S.</u>, 969 F.3d 251, 263–64 (6th Cir. 2020); see also <u>U.S. v. McBride</u>, 826 <u>F.3d 293, 295–96 (6th Cir. 2016)</u>.